



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,657	01/08/2002	Timothy E. Bennett	088305-0141	8992
7590	08/28/2006			EXAMINER WASEL, MOHAMED A
William T. Ellis Foley & Lardner Washington Harbour 3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500 Washington, DC 20007-5143			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/038,657	BENNETT ET AL.
	Examiner Mohamed Wasel	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-9,11-14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-9,11-14 and 16-21 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on June 13, 2006.

Claims 5, 10 and 15 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 are presented for examination

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The use of a **comma** (,) in line 7, 14 and 17 of claim 1 needs to be replaced with a **semi-colon** (;) and wherever it is applicable. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The use of a **comma** (,) in line 7, 13 and 15 of claim 6 needs to be replaced with a **semi-colon** (;) and wherever it is applicable. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: The use of a **comma** (,) in line 7, 13 and 15 of claim 11 needs to be replaced with a **semi-colon** (;) and wherever it is applicable. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: The use of a **comma** (,) in line 7 of claim 18 needs to be replaced with a **semi-colon** (;) and wherever it is applicable. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The

limitation " **analyzing ... the first, second and third extracting steps**" on line 14 of claim 1 renders the claim indefinite because it's unclear to the Examiner what it pertains to. Appropriate correction is required.

In addition, claim 1 recites the limitation " **a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data ...**" in line 9 of claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 11-14 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 1.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ricker et al, (hereinafter "Rocker") US Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0049790 in view of Chen et al, (hereinafter "Chen") US Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0111964.

1. As per claim 1, Rocker teaches a computer implemented method of automatically extracting information from Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) documents or messages using an EDI system, to be used in analysis of the EDI documents (***Paragraph [0012], [0046]***), comprising:

extracting segments, transaction sets, functional groups (***Page 10, Appendix Line 26***), and attributes from an EDI document, as extracted data (***Paragraph [0048], [0075], Abstract***);  
storing the extracted data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether the extracted data is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data (***Paragraph [0075], [0096]***),

extracting at least one functional group (***Page 10, Appendix Line 26***) from the EDI document from the memory and extracting at least one transaction set from the EDI document that is a part of the at

least one functional group, based on a linkage in the memory of the at least one transaction set to the at least one functional group (*Paragraph [0059], [0081], [0096], [0098]*); and  
analyzing the EDI document based on information obtained in the first, second and third extracting steps (*Paragraph [0043], [0046]*),

wherein each of the extracted data stored in the memory is assigned an attribute that is also stored in the memory and that is linked to each of the extracted data and wherein the at least one functional group and the at least one transaction set extracted from the EDI document are stored in the memory with a common attribute (*Paragraph [0059], [0075], [0096], [0099]*).

Rocker discloses representing any XML document as a tree structure and embedding all elements within the document with a master tag (*Paragraph [0059]*).

Rocker fails to explicitly teach storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory.

However, Chen discloses storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*Paragraph [0011], [0045]*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of Rocker and Chen because it provides an efficient way of retrieving data related to a given element within an EDI document based on the hierarchical relationship.

2. As per claim 2, Rocker discloses extracting an EDI document in its entirety and storing it in memory including at least one segment (*Paragraph [0075], [0096]*).

Rocker fails to explicitly teach storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory.

However, Chen discloses storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*Paragraph [0011], [0045]*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of Rocker and Chen because it provides an efficient way of retrieving data related to a given segment based on the hierarchical relationship.

3. As per claim 3, Rocker discloses extracting an EDI document in its entirety and storing it in memory including at least one transaction set (*Paragraph [0075], [0096]*).

Rocker fails to explicitly teach storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory.

However, Chen discloses storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*Paragraph [0011], [0045]*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of Rocker and Chen because it provides an efficient way of retrieving data related to a given transaction set based on the hierarchical relationship such as purchase orders and invoices.

4. As per claim 4, Rocker discloses extracting an EDI document in its entirety and storing it in memory including at least one functional group (*Paragraph [0075], [0096], Page 10, Appendix Line 26*).

Rocker fails to explicitly teach storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory.

However, Chen discloses storing the EDI document in the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*Paragraph [0011], [0045]*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of Rocker and Chen because it provides an optimized method of reconstructing EDI documents based on user-defined rules when exchanging EDI messages among businesses.

Art Unit: 2154

5. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 1.
6. Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 2.
7. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 3.
8. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 4.

9. As per claim 16, Rocker fails to explicitly teach providing a graphical user interface to enable a user to select at least one attribute to be retrieved from the memory in order to create an EDI document, and to enable the user to select a particular document shell for which the data retrieved from the memory is to be inputted, extracting data from the memory based on the at least one attribute selected by the user and providing the extracted data into the particular document shell selected by the user, to provide the EDI document for the user on the graphical user interface to allow for further editing and updating of the EDI document by the user.

However, Chen discloses providing a graphical user interface memory (*Paragraph [0009]*) to enable a user to select at least one attribute to be retrieved from the memory in order to create an EDI document, and to enable the user to select a particular document shell for which the data retrieved from the memory is to be inputted, extracting data from the memory based on the at least one attribute selected by the user memory (*Abstract*) and providing the extracted data into the particular document shell selected by the user, to provide the EDI document for the user on the graphical user interface to allow for further editing and updating of the EDI document by the user memory (*Paragraph [0011], [0045]*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of Rocker and Chen because it provides an efficient way of displaying, retrieving, editing and updating an EDI documents.

10. As per claim 17, Rocker teaches the method wherein the storing step comprises:  
storing the EDI document in the memory as a document object having one or more attributes, storing any segments extracted from the EDI document as document segments in the memory each

having one or more attributes, storing any transaction sets extracted from the EDI document as transaction set segments in the memory each having one or more attributes and storing any functional groups extracted from the EDI document as functional group segments in the memory each having one or more attributes (*Paragraph [0075], [0081], [0096], Page 10, Appendix Line 26*).

11. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 16.
12. Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 17.

#### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (*Notice of Reference Cited*) for a list of relevant prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Wasel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MW  
August 9, 2006

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100